



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Upon reviewing the case, the examiner believed that Paras. 41-44 of the specification (2003/0109302 A1) discussing the determination of the rejection rate was the most significant passage relating as to what the claims as a whole were trying to do. No mention in the closest prior art, cited above, is made of tying this rejection rate to a malfunction for the machine. Mr. Huter subsequently e-mailed proposed amendments along these lines for entry by examiner's amendment. On 11-04-2009, the examiner received verbal permission to change "rating" in claims 21, 22, 23, and 27 to "rate" for more consistent terminology, and to change claim 22's dependency from 21 to 19, and 23's dependency from 22 to 19, as 21, 22, and 23 are separate dependent claims specifying different ranges..